REMARKS

By this amendment claims 18-35 are pending.

The Examiner objected to claims 18 and 32 for lack of indentation. These claims have been rewritten with indentations. Also, the Examiner rejected claims 34 and 35 as being non-enabled. The Examiner stated that there was no disclosure of sub-domains in the instant specification.

Claims 34 and 35 have been amended to replace the term "sub-domains" with "sub-organizations," the term found on page 13, line 19. The Examiner also rejected claims 18, 20, 28 and 32 as being indefinite. In claims 18 and 32, the Examiner stated that it was unclear whether the system comprised both a service manager and components of a distributed electronic system or a service manager interacting with an information repository and components of a distributed system.

The claims have been amended to make it clear that the claims are directed to an automated provisioning system controlling the authorization and activation of services on a distributed electronic system. The invention is the service manager, not the electronic system itself. Reference to the system is made in intended use language. Claims 20 and 32 have been amended to overcome the rejection. Specifically, claim 20 is amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and in claim 32 the term "and/or" has been amended to simply "for."

The technical problem addressed by the invention is set out on pages 1 and 2 of the description. Prior to the invention, service providers such as Telcos and Cable TV companies did not have the facility to rapidly create self service online products such as subscription to services such as a new voicemail or new TV channels. The inventor's system was the first to be able to provide such rapid provisioning that could be used on large scale networks. It is well established that larger the network the harder it is to be able to rapidly provision new services (this is known as scalability) and generally within software it is very difficult

to write highly scalable programs. With this in mind, it can be readily seen that Schultz is not relevant to Claim 18. Schultz relates to a system and method for presenting data from a plurality of sources to a user. It does not deal with provisioning, i.e. activating services in a communications network.

Schultz discloses an automated process but does not disclose any provisioning, whether automated or not. At column 3 lines 45-55, Schultz discloses a routine messenging service that simply sends an alert when an event pertinent to that user has occurred. This feature is also disclosed in the application, where it is called a trigger server (see page 7 final paragraph). This is not a service as such. The application defines services on page 12, line 17 as:

> "Services are the logical association of different pieces of infrastructure and/or existing services, which cooperate to provide the requirements of a particular entity. The infrastructure may be the network hardware such as routers, switches, workstations or any other type of hardware that the APS will manage. The infrastructure may also be applications such as firewalls, mail servers, operating systems or any other type of software that the APS system will manage."

The service manager manages these services by permitting the abstraction of the services away from the physical infrastructure. Abstraction is a standard principle of object oriented programming and means the process of taking away or removing characteristics from something in order to reduce it to a set of essential characteristics. Claim 31 recites this feature.

Previously, an objection was based on the server engine 26 disclosed by Schultz being the same as the service manager of the invention. The server engine simply manages the content requests

received from the user interface (column 4, lines 31-33, lines 44-5, lines 55-67). The server engine 26 does not permit any abstraction of services away from the infrastructure - it simply manages content requests and orders them accordingly.

The authorization to access services described by the Examiner is simply a permission based security mechanism to access content stored on the repository on the server, i.e. password protected files, whereas the services of the invention are associated with the infrastructure of the distributed system, not the contents of the repository. The repository contains the data model, i.e. it models the data comprising the infrastructure most, if not all of which is external to the repository.

Unlike previously known systems, the service manager permits the abstraction of the services away from the infrastructure and allows them to be modelled in the directory enabled repository. This greatly simplifies the management of the system in that it is much less complex than taking the usual network element view of the infrastructure. This combination of features permits the rapid provisioning of services in a manner not shown or suggested by the prior art.

With respect to claim 32, the comments in relation to the service manager and the concept of services are equally applicable. Schultz does not disclose a system with a scalable data model. At column 6 line 47-49, it clearly states that the repository includes multiple tables, i.e. the data is organized into rows and columns. The approach recited in Claim 32 eschews the table approach to organizing data and instead models the data into domains comprising four object types (and sub-domains). Domains are not the same as domain names. Domains are broadly speaking areas of control on the system. The domain name that the Examiner refers to is simply a useful handle for remembering an IP address and is stored on the various domain name servers. The two are self evidently very different.

Schultz furthermore does not disclose the use of configuration objects and indeed cannot have them as Schultz opts for the conventional table driven approach, which does not have a place for them. The Examiner does not cite a passage against these. All that the passage cited by the Examiner at the end of the paragraph states is that a user has a profile (long standard in IT). The profile simply lists (in table format), the news channels that the user wants to see. Profiles simply permit the easy creation of new users having shared characteristics. The data is simply stored in tables and is not modeled as required by Claim 32 and therefore does not show the service and infrastructure objects and does not have any of the configuration objects. The advantage of the data model (in addition to the service manager) is that is permits high scalability (over 10 million users) as well as mapping the data, profiles, service and infrastructure to the user. This is not shown in Schultz or by anyone else and is both novel and inventive.

A two month Extension of Time accompanies this response. If any additional fees are due and owing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2455.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. McDonald
Reg. No. 41,533

May 30, 2006

MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP
11377 West Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90064-1683
TELEPHONE: (310) 312-2000

Attorney's Docket: A-7081.RCE.AMC